

# Experimenting with Prose and Verse in Twelfth-Century Byzantium *A Preliminary Study*

NIKOS ZAGKLAS

Δέχου, πάτερ, τὸ πένθος ἔγγραφον, δέχου,  
ὁ δυστυχῶς ἔτλημεν ἐξ ἐναντίων.  
εὖχου, πάτερ, μοὶ τῷ καθειργμένῳ τέκνῳ,  
ὅπως θεός μοι χεῖρα δῶ προμηθείας.

Accept, father, accept in written form my mourning, which, in misfortune, we have endured because of our enemies. Pray, father, for me, your imprisoned child, that God may give me his solicitous hand.

This iambic tetrastich is preserved on fol. 150<sup>r</sup> of the eleventh-century codex Parisinus graecus 3032, immediately before a partly surviving prose letter to Leo the Archdeacon that describes the capture of Syracuse by the Arabs in the year 880.<sup>1</sup> Both were written by Theodosios the Grammarian, either during the siege of Syracuse or slightly later at the beginning of the tenth century.<sup>2</sup> The tetrastich is a metrical

paratext that introduces the content of the prose letter to the recipient, asking him to pray for the writer's desperate situation after the Arab invasion. What is more important for our purposes, however, is that here prose and verse are closely interlinked. The Byzantines may not have set clear-cut boundaries between the composition of prose and verse,<sup>3</sup> but this does not mean that they could not distinguish between the two forms.<sup>4</sup> A learned Byzantine could hear the rhythmical difference and see the visual one; in the same vein, the recipient of Theodosios the Grammarian's letter and iambic epigram would probably notice and appreciate the acoustic and visual diversity generated by the juxtaposition of prose and verse.

2.1:70–79; R. Anastasi, “L'epistola di Teodosio Monaco,” *Archivio Storico Siracusano* 5 (1978–79): 169–82.

3 Both were subcategories of the broader category *hoi logoi* (= “discursive practices” or simply “texts”); see F. Bernard, *Writing and Reading Byzantine Secular Poetry 1025–1081* (Oxford, 2014), 31–57. For the designation of Byzantine texts as *logoi* see also *ODB* 2:1234. Of course, there are also exceptions to this practice. Bernard has discussed some eleventh-century cases, while we come across additional ones in twelfth-century texts. For example, Theodore Prodromos, in a metrical prologue for the schedographical collection of Ioannikios the monk, makes a distinction between prose and verse *logoi*; see Prodromos, *Historical Poem* 61, in *Theodoros Prodromos: Historische Gedichte*, ed. W. Hörandner (Vienna, 1974), 493, v. 9: χαρίτες ἐν πεζοῖσι καὶ ἐμμέτροισι λόγοισιν.

4 See V. Valiavitcharska, *Rhetoric and Rhythm in Byzantium: The Sound of Persuasion* (Cambridge, 2013), 18.

1 Leo the Archdeacon, *Poem*, ed. C. Zuretti, “Ἰταλοελληνικά,” in *Centenario della nascita di Michele Amari* (Palermo, 1910), 165–84, at 165–68.

2 For studies on the letter and its importance for the siege of Syracuse see S. G. Mercati, “Sul codice perduto della lettera di Teodosio Monaco Siracusano,” in *Per la storia dei manoscritti greci di Genova, di varie badie basiliane d'Italia e di Patmo*, ed. S. Mercati (Vatican City, 1935), 320–29; B. Lavagnini, “Siracusa occupata dagli Arabi e l'epistola di Teodosio monaco,” *Byzantion* 29/39 (1959–60): 267–77; A. A. Vasiliev, *Byzance et les Arabes*, 3 vols. (Brussels, 1968),

As with Theodosios, who supplemented his prose with a verse text, many other authors exploited poetry's distinct merits in various ways throughout Byzantine times.<sup>5</sup> This holds true especially for the Komnenian period, when the production of verse was substantially larger than in any other century in middle and late Byzantine times.<sup>6</sup> Komnenian poets frequently experimented with form and genre to impress their imperial and aristocratic patrons.<sup>7</sup> For example, in the first decades of the twelfth century certain genres traditionally written in prose began to appear in verse form. The practice of writing novels is a case in point. Unlike their ancient models, three of the four Komnenian novels are written in verse form. Regardless of whether it was

Theodore Prodromos who revived the novel genre,<sup>8</sup> his *Rhodanthe and Dosicles*, written in 4614 verses,<sup>9</sup> is the first extant verse novel written in Byzantium. Following the paradigm of his teacher, Niketas Eugenianos composed his novel *Drosilla and Charicles* in 3638 verses.<sup>10</sup> While Prodromos and Eugenianos chose the dodecasyllable, Constantine Manasses wrote his *Aristandros and Kallithea* in political verse. Manasses also composed his chronicle in this meter, a genre previously written mainly in prose.<sup>11</sup>

Even the scale of encomiastic ceremonial discourse leans in favor of poetry during the Komnenian period. Many texts celebrating the victories of the Komnenoi (especially of John II and Manuel I Komnenos) and other imperial ceremonies were composed in verse. Again Theodore Prodromos seems to be the principal instigator of this trend,<sup>12</sup> but he is followed by the so-called Manganeios Prodromos<sup>13</sup> and later Komnenian writers, such as Niketas Choniates and Euthymios Tornikes.<sup>14</sup> Other twelfth-century developments that

5 On the visual and acoustic merits of poetry, see Bernard, *Byzantine Secular Poetry*, 75–84. Figure poetry is another telling example of these visual advantages; see D. Higgins, *Pattern Poetry: Guide to an Unknown Literature* (Albany, NY, 1987), 19–24; W. Hörandner, “Visuelle Poesie in Byzanz: Versuch einer Bestandsaufnahme,” *JÖB* 40 (1990): 1–42; idem, “Weitere Beobachtungen zu byzantinischen Figurengedichten und Tetragrammen,” *Nea Rhome* 6 (2009): 291–304; U. Ernst, *Carmen figuratum: Geschichte des Figurengedichts von den antiken Ursprüngen bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Cologne, 1991), 738–65; idem, “Literaturbeziehungen zwischen Byzanz und dem Westen: Das Figurengedicht als europäische Gattung im Spannungsfeld zweier Kulturen,” *Das Mittelalter* 6, no. 2 (2001): 61–83; and more recently L. Diamantopoulou, *Griechische visuelle Poesie: Von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart* (Frankfurt am Main, 2016), 63–105.

6 As has already been pointed out by E. Jeffreys, “Why Produce Verse in Twelfth-Century Constantinople?” in *Doux remède . . . : Poésie et poétique à Byzance*, ed. P. Odorico, P. A. Agapitos, and M. Hinterberger (Paris, 2009), 219–28. For Komnenian poetry see also M. D. Lauxtermann, “La poesia,” in *Lo spazio letterario del medioevo* 3: *Le culture circostate*, vol. 1, *La cultura bizantina*, ed. G. Cavallo and G. de Gregorio (Rome, 2004), 301–43; J. Signes Codoñer, “Poesía profana bizantina en los siglos X–XII: Entre tradición e innovación,” in *Poesía medieval: Historia literaria y transmisión de textos*, ed. V. V. Martínez and C. P. González (Burgos, 2005), 19–66, and more recently P. Magdalino, “Cultural Change? The Context of Byzantine Poetry from Geometres to Prodromos,” in *Poetry and Its Contexts in Eleventh-Century Byzantium*, ed. F. Bernard and K. Demoen (Farnham and Burlington, 2012), 19–36.

7 It was they, after all, who offered new commissions or, hopefully, highly desired promotions; on this issue see M. Mullett, “Aristocracy and Patronage in the Literary Circles of Komnenian Constantinople,” in *The Byzantine Aristocracy, IX to XIII Centuries*, ed. M. Angold (Oxford, 1984), 173–201; P. Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180* (Cambridge, 1993), 343–51, and more recently I. Nilsson, “La douceur des dons abondants: Patronage et littérature dans la Constantinople des Comnènes,” in *La face cachée de la littérature Byzantine: Le texte en tant que message immédiat*, ed. P. Odorico (Paris, 2012), 179–94.

8 For the debate on the sequence of composition of the Komnenian novels see E. Jeffreys, *Four Byzantine Novels* (Liverpool, 2012), 7–10 and 161–65 (with bibliography) as well as Nilsson, *Raconter Byzance: La littérature du 12<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 2014), 58–60.

9 All in dodecasyllables, except for a passage in hexameters; see Prodromos, *Rhodanthe and Dosicles*, ed. M. Marcovich, *Theodori Prodromi Rhodanthes et Dosiclis amorum libri IX* (Stuttgart, 1991), 9.196–204.

10 All in dodecasyllables, except for two songs and a lament in hexameters; see Eugenianos, *Drosilla and Charicles*, in *Nicetas Eugenianus, De Drosillae et Chariclis amoribus*, ed. F. Conca (Amsterdam, 1990), 3.263–288/3.297–320 and 6.205–235, respectively.

11 We know only of a verse chronicle by Apollodoros of Athens (2nd c. BCE), ranging from the fall of Troy to ca. 143 BCE. For a study see B. Bravo, *La Chronique d'Apollodore et le Pseudo-Skymnos: Érudition antiquaire et littérature géographique dans la seconde moitié du I<sup>er</sup> siècle av. J.-C.* (Leuven, 2009).

12 Most of them are to be found in Hörandner, *Theodoros Prodromos*.

13 For some preliminary notes on the relation between the works of the two authors see M. Jeffreys, “Written Dekapentasyllables and Their Oral Provenance: A Skeleton History and a Suggested New Line of Research,” in *Medieval Greek Storytelling: Fictionality and Narrative in Byzantium*, ed. P. Roilos (Wiesbaden, 2014), 203–31, esp. 212–13.

14 For a general overview of twelfth-century court poetry from Prodromos to Choniates see W. Hörandner, “Court Poetry: Questions of Motifs, Structure and Function,” in *Rhetoric in Byzantium*, ed. E. Jeffreys (Aldershot, 2003), 75–85. For Tornikes see his multimetric encomiastic cycle for Isaac II Angelos, edited in A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Noctes Petropolitanæ* (St. Petersburg, 1913), 188–98.

highlight the special relation of verse and prose are the innovative functions that many twelfth-century literati imposed on epigrammatic poetry. In addition to numerous metrical paratexts meant to present, praise, and elucidate prose works,<sup>15</sup> in the mid-twelfth century a new practice was introduced that demonstrates another special interaction between prose and verse in a performative context: the so-called metrical prefaces, which were delivered before the reading of prose homilies or hagiographical texts in church services.<sup>16</sup> The earliest examples of this practice are most likely two poems by Theodore Prodromos; but Manganeios Prodromos, Nikephoros Prosouch, John Apokaukos, and Nikephoros Chrysoberges also wrote such epigrams.<sup>17</sup>

Undoubtedly, all the above-mentioned examples signify a change in the balance between prose and verse, or demonstrate some interactions between the two modes of composition in twelfth-century Byzantium. In the latter case, however, verse serves mostly a paratextual function (just as in the case of Theodosios the Grammarian's tetrastich). Hence the prose and verse in these cases are only loosely connected, especially when compared to the Latin literary practices of the *prosimetrum* or *opus geminatum*, both of which exhibit a remarkable internal symbiosis of prose and verse.<sup>18</sup> In the present paper I will demonstrate that twelfth-century Byzantine literature displays comparable practices. In an attempt to achieve stylistic versatility and meet the expectations of their literary patrons and commissioners, many authors of this period succeeded in forging a much more dynamic bond between these two modes of composition across a wide range of

literary genres. To make this twelfth-century development more tangible, this paper will provide a preliminary survey of two practices that have so far been little studied. The first section will examine single works whose narrative is a mixture of prose and verse. The second section will provide an overview of the practice of writing multiple separate works, all of them associated with the same event, in prose, verse, and occasionally schedography. There are many differences between these two practices, but both of them represent the various changes that the symbiosis of prose and verse witnessed in the twelfth century. By discussing these two twelfth-century practices, we can expand the picture of twelfth-century literary experimentation and acquire a more nuanced understanding of the interaction between prose and verse in Byzantium.

### Blending Prose with Verse: "Mixed Works"

In the late thirteenth century Manuel Holobolos and Maximos Planoudes undertook the task of translating Latin literary works into Greek.<sup>19</sup> Among the various works that Planoudes translated was Boethius's *De Consolatione Philosophiae*,<sup>20</sup> the most famous representative of *prosimetrum*, a term that denotes works written in a hybrid amalgamation of prose and verse.<sup>21</sup> Boethius had some influence on Greek literary culture

15 There are many examples by both well-known and less known authors. For example, Prodromos composed a laudatory book epigram to preface a collection of *schede* by his friend and fellow *grammatikos*, Ioannikios the monk: Prodromos, *Historical Poems* 61, ed. Hörandner, 492–93.

16 See the excellent survey in T. Antonopoulou, "On the Reception of Homilies and Hagiography in Byzantium: The Recited Metrical Prefaces," in *Imitatio–Aemulatio–Variatio: Akten des internationalen wissenschaftlichen Symposions zur byzantinischen Sprache und Literatur*, ed. A. Rhoby and E. Schiffer (Vienna, 2010), 57–79 (trans. in Greek in eadem, *Βυζαντινή ομιλητική: Συγγραφείς και κείμενα* [Athens, 2013], 198–257).

17 Ibid., 62–68.

18 For literature on these two practices see notes 21 and 67, respectively.

19 For the driving forces behind these translations see E. A. Fisher, "Planoudes, Holobolos, and the Motivation for Translation," *GRBS* 43 (2002): 77–104.

20 In his translation Planoudes decided to stay close to the Latin model and produce a text that combined prose and verse; see Planoudes, *Boethius's De Consolatione Philosophiae*, ed. M. Papathomopoulos, *Anicii Manlii Severini Boethii De consolatione philosophiae: Traduction grecque de Maxime Planude* (Athens, 1999).

21 The most thorough study of *prosimetrum* from late antiquity to the middle ages remains B. Pabst, *Prosimetrum: Tradition und Wandel einer Literaturform zwischen Spätantike und Spätmittelalter*, 2 vols. (Cologne, 1994); for discussions of *prosimetrum* from various angles see P. Dronke, *Verse with Prose from Petronius to Dante: The Art and Scope of the Mixed Form* (Cambridge, 1994) and J. M. Ziolkowski, "The Prosimetrum in the Classical Tradition," in *Prosimetrum: Crosscultural Perspectives on Narrative in Prose and Verse*, ed. J. Harris and K. Reichl (Cambridge, 1997), 45–65; for the western twelfth century see B. K. Balint, *Ordering Chaos: The Self and the Cosmos in Twelfth-Century Latin Prosimetrum* (Leiden, 2009). For the mixing of prose and verse in Greek literature see D. Bartoňková, "Prosimetrum, the Mixed Style, in Ancient Literature," *Eirene* 14 (1976): 65–92.

even before Planoudes's translation,<sup>22</sup> but, as expected, it is not comparable to the popularity he enjoyed in the Latin West. His *Consolatione Philosophiae* was one of the most popular and influential philosophical works and was considered the model par excellence for the writers of prosimetrum from the Carolingian period to the Middle Ages and beyond. This is especially true for the twelfth-century Latin West: roughly between the years 1100 and 1170, the genre of the "philosophical-didactic-allegorical prosimetrum"<sup>23</sup> emerges with the following five works: Hilbert of Lavardin's *Querimonia*, Adelard of Bath's *De eodem et diverso*, Laurence of Durham's *Consolatio de morte amici*, Bernardus Silvestris's *Cosmographia*, and Alan of Lille's *De planctu Naturae*.<sup>24</sup>

Even though such full-fledged prosimetric compositions do not exist in Byzantium, many Komnenian authors start to develop various techniques of mixing these two forms for the composition of a single work. Most often, they borrow verses from ancient Greek poetry and introduce them into their prose works without marking them as quotations.<sup>25</sup> One good example of this technique is *Hysmine and Hysminias*, the single Komnenian novel in prose, by Eumathios Makrembolites. Makrembolites embellished the narrative of his novel with numerous well-known ancient verses.<sup>26</sup> To give but one example: the prose and verse parts of the narrative are perfectly stitched together in terms of syntax and content in the third book of

the novel, where Kratisthenes comforts his friend Hysminias with Homer's words:<sup>27</sup>

Ὑσμίνη καὶ λίαν καλή, καὶ νέμεσις οὐδεμία  
τοιγῇδ' ἀμφὶ γυναικὶ πολὺν χρόνον ἄλγεα  
πάσχειν. (cf. *Iliad* 3.156–57)

Hysmine is lovely, indeed very lovely and **there is no wrong**  
**in suffering** many years for such a woman.

The coexistence of prose and verse in Makrembolites' novel occasionally goes beyond the insertion of quotations from ancient Greek poetry. In three cases the author made use of metrical parts that are not just citations, but epigrams written by the author himself. All three epigrams accompany the wall paintings in the garden described in the second and fourth books of the novel, and are excellent examples of the symbiosis of prose with epigrammatic poetry within the same work.<sup>28</sup> For instance, instead of employing an extensive description in prose, Makrembolites inserts a two-line epigram into the prose narrative of the novel, with the phrase "it went as follows," that helps him convey to the intended reader the image of the wall painting depicting Emperor Eros in the garden of Sosthenes:<sup>29</sup>

Ἄλλ' ἴδωμεν, εἰ δοκεῖ, καὶ τὰ ὑπὲρ τὴν τοῦ  
μειρακίου κεφαλὴν γεγραμμένα.  
Ἰαμβεῖα <δ' ἦν> οὕτως ἔχοντα

Ἐρως τὸ μειράκιον ὄπλα, πῦρ φέρον,  
Τόξον, πτερόν, γύμνωσιν, ἰχθύων βέλος

22 Mainly on the works of authors who were active in twelfth-century Norman Sicily; see C. Cupane, "Fortune rota volvitur: Moira e Tyche nel carne nr. 1 di Eugenio da Palermo," *Nea Rhome* 8 (2011): 137–52, and M. D. Lauxtermann, "Tomi, Mljet, Malta: Critical Notes on a Twelfth-Century Southern Italian Poem of Exile," *JÖB* 64 (2014): 155–76, esp. 162.

23 For the term see Pabst, *Prosimetrum*, 1:388.

24 For a study of all five works see Balint, *Ordering Chaos*.

25 It is interesting to note that Pabst claims that such a combination of prose and verse is considered a "Grenzfall" of the prosimetric structure of a work, while Bartoňková has noted that this is one of the two types of writing prosimetrum; see Pabst, *Prosimetrum*, 1:77 and Bartoňková, "Prosimetrum," 7.

26 I count nineteen citations: 1.13.2; 2.7.2; 2.14.6; 3.9.2; 3.9.6; 4.3.3; 5.3.8; 6.7.1; 6.14.7; 6.15.3; 8.11.2; 8.12.2; 8.14.2; 8.14.4; 8.20.3; 9.23.1; 9.23.2; 10.6.5; 11.15.5. In contrast with Makrembolites, in Byzantine letters the quotations are inserted mostly as an alien feature or a mere quotation. However, there are some letters by John Tzetzes with a metrical part that is not a simple quotation; see the discussion on page 237.

27 Eumathios Makrembolitis, *Hysmine and Hysminias* 3.9.2, ed. M. Marcovich, *Eustathius Macrembolites, De Hysmines et Hysminiae amoribus libri XI* (Munich, 2001); trans. in Jeffreys, *Four Byzantine Novels*, 198.

28 P. A. Agapitos, "Writing, Reading and Reciting (in) Byzantine Erotic Fiction," in *Lire et écrire à Byzance*, ed. B. Mondrain (Paris, 2006), 125–76 and C. Cupane, "Das erfundene Epigramm: Schrift und Bild im Roman," in *Die kulturhistorische Bedeutung byzantinischer Epigramme*, ed. W. Hörandner and A. Rhoby (Vienna, 2008), 19–28, at 20–21.

29 Makrembolitis, *Hysmine and Hysminias*, ed. Marcovich, 2.10.5; trans. in Jeffreys, *Four Byzantine Novels*, 190.



But let us look, if you like, at what is written above the lad's head. There were iambic verses, which went as follows:

This lad is Eros, with his sword, torch,  
Bow, arrows, nudity. A dart aimed at fishes.

Another Constantinopolitan author who uses the technique of embellishing a prose text with entire poems is Theodore Prodromos. In his work *Amarantos, or the Erotic Desires of an Old Man*, one of the works that builds—at least partially—upon Lucian,<sup>30</sup> Prodromos includes two verse epithalamia sung at the wedding of a very young girl to the aged philosopher and teacher Stratocles, who used to dismiss the idea of marriage and any kind of bodily pleasure. At the wedding banquet, old Stratocles, who has previously been compared to a jester, appears to be fonder of wine than of the young maiden. Aristoboulos leans over to his friend, the main hero Amarantos, and tells him that the bridegroom's cheek has grown red because of his shame. When Amarantos starts laughing, all the wedding guests think that it was Amarantos's intention to ridicule the bridegroom. At this point the grammarian Dionysios stands up and recites an epithalamium of six elegiac couplets in honor of the bridegroom:<sup>31</sup>

Καὶ τάχα ἂν πρὸς κακοῦ ἐλάθομεν παρεισκυ-  
κλήσαντες τὸ φύκος τῷ λόγῳ, εἰ μὴ Διονύσιος ὁ  
γραμματικὸς ἀνασταίη τε τῆς καθέδρας εὐθὺς καὶ  
τοῦ κόλπου τὸ βιβλίον ἐξαγαγὼν τὸν ἐπιθαλάμιον  
ἀναγνῶη. Εἶχε δὲ ὧδέ πη τὰ ἐλεγεία.

Χαίρετ' ἀριστογάμων καλλίχροα δέμνια κούρων,  
τοῦ τε Στρατοκλέους τῆς τε Μυριλλιδίου.  
Χαῖρε γάμος τε λέχος τε νεηλεχέων αἰζηῶν.  
χαῖρε γαμοστολὴ καὶ θαλαμηπολὴ.

30 For the text see T. Migliorini, "Teodoro Prodromo, *Amaranto*," *Medioevo Greco* 7 (2007): 183–247; for excellent discussions of the work see E. Cullhed, "Teodoro Pródromo en el Jardín de Epicuro," in *Aproximaciones interdisciplinarias a la Antigüedad griega y latina: VI Jornadas Filológicas, Bogotá. Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Universidad de los Andes, Universidad de la Sabana*, ed. R. Álvarez and L. Almandós (Bogotá, 2015), 369–93 and idem, "Theodore Prodromos in the Garden of Epicurus: The Amarantos," in *Dialogues and Debates from Late Antiquity to Late Byzantium*, ed. A. Cameron and N. Gaul (London and New York, 2017), 153–66.

31 *Prodromos, Amarantos*, ed. Migliorini, 193–94.

Οὐδέ σ', Ἄρες πτολίπορθε καὶ Ἀφρογένεια  
μεγίστη,

νυμφίος ἱμερόεις καὶ νύμφη ζαθέη  
τάρβηθεν, χαρίτεσσι φυαῖς τ' ἀγαθοῖς τε  
προσώποις.

Νυμφίε, ὡς ἀγαθός, ὡς εὐμορφος ἔης,  
ξανθός, ἐρευθώδης, μελανόφρυς, βοτρυοχαίτης.

Καὶ σὺ δέ, ὦ νύμφη, χαῖρε, ἀριστόλοχε.  
Χαίρετ' ἐγὼ δ' ὕμνιν θαλαμηῖον ὕμνον αἰείδω  
τόνδ', ὀλιγοστιχίης παιῖδα Λακωνιάδος.

Ταῦτα ἐκεῖνος εἶπεν καὶ ἐπευφήμησε τὸ συμπόσιον.

And maybe we would have made a mistake to speak about his flushed cheeks, if the grammarian Dionysios had not immediately stood up from his seat and, after pulling out a book from the folds of his garment, read the epithalamium. The elegiac couplets went more or less as follows:

Hail, beautifully colored bedstead of the youths who are best suited for marriage, both Stratocles and young Myrilla! Hail, wedding and bed of the newly married prosperous young people! Hail, Aphrodite, since you preside over weddings and take care of the bedchamber! The charming groom and the divine bride, with their beauty, pretty statues and faces, did not fear even you, Ares, sacker of the cities, and mighty Aphrodite! O groom, how gentle, how beautiful you are; blond, with reddish complexion, dark eyebrows, clustering hair! And you, hail, O noble bride! Hail, for you I sing this wedding hymn, a child of Laconic brevity.

So he sang those verses and cheered the symposium.

After Dionysios's laudatory, ekphrastic, and ironic epithalamium, Stratocles and Amarantos debate the merits of marriage in a prose dialogue. As the debate becomes more intense, it is unexpectedly interrupted with the delivery of a second epithalamium by the comedian Chaerephon:<sup>32</sup>

32 *Ibid.*, 195.

Καὶ ἐν τούτοις ὁ κωμικὸς ἀνίσταται Χαιρεφῶν καὶ· “Τούτων μὲν ἄλλος ἡμῖν,” εἶπεν, “ἐγὼ δὲ τι τῆς Ἀνακρέοντος μούσης ὡς ἐν κατευναστικοῦ μοίρα ὑποτραγωδήσω τῇ ἑορτῇ.” Καὶ ἅμα ἔλεγε·

Θεάων ἄνασσα, Κύπρι,  
 Ἰμερε, κράτος χθονίων,  
 Γάμε, βιότοιο φύλαξ,  
 ὑμέας λόγοις λιγαίνω,  
 ὑμέας στίχοις κυδαίνω,  
 Ἰμερον, Γάμον, Παφίην.  
 Δέρκεο τὴν νεάνιν, δέρκεο, κοῦρε·  
 ἔγρεο, μή σε φύγη πέρδικος ἄγρα.

Στρατόκλεις, φίλος Κυθείρης,  
 Στρατόκλεις, ἄνερ Μυρίλλας,  
 ἴδε τὴν φίλην γυναῖκα,  
 κομáει, τέθηλε, λάμπει·  
 ῥόδον ἀνθέων ἀνάσσει,  
 ῥόδον ἐν κόραις Μύριλλα.  
 Ἡέλιος τὰ σέθεν δέμνια φαίνει·  
 Κυπάριττος πεφύκοι σὼ ἐνὶ κήπῳ.

At that moment the comedian Chaerephon stood up and said, “Enough of these arguments: I will recite a few verses of the Anacreontic Muse as a part of the epithalamium for the feast.” And at once he said:

Queen of Goddesses, o Cyprian; Desire, might of mortals; Marriage, guardian of life. I sing for you with words, I glorify you with verses, o Desire, Marriage, Paphian goddess. Behold the young maiden, behold, o young lad; awake, do not let your partridge quarry escape!

Stratocles, friend of the Cytherean one; Stratocles, husband of Myrilla, look at your dear wife; she flourishes, she blooms, she shines; the rose is the lord of flowers, Myrilla is the rose among the maidens. The sun illuminates your bedsteads; a cypress has grown in your garden.

Certainly, it is very interesting that Prodrōmos made use of a popular ceremonial poetic genre for the sake of the narrative of a literary work. The metrical form of the two epithalamia may differ (the first one is in elegiac

couplets, the second in anacreontics), but both appear at turning points in the narrative and obviously aim to enhance the satiric tone of the work; the epithalamion in elegiac couplets presents a reverse image of old Stratocles as young and beautiful; while the one in anacreontics summons Stratocles, who is ironically called “young lad,” to wake up and look at the beautiful bride.

Prodrōmos uses a slightly different technique of mixing prose with verse in his *Bion Prasis* (*Sale of Political and Poetical Lives*).<sup>33</sup> This comic dialogue, which has been described as a “sequel” to Lucian’s *Bion Prasis*,<sup>34</sup> narrates the auctioning of six ancient authors (Homer, Hippocrates, Aristophanes, Euripides, Pomponius, and Demosthenes) to six uneducated and vulgar buyers. Hermes, who conducts the auction, manages to sell all the authors except Aristophanes. The work is filled with no fewer than forty-five verses of various meters (hexameters, elegiac couplets, dodecasyllables, and even pentameters). Most of these verses are uttered by Homer, but Hermes, Hippocrates, and Euripides also speak in verse. Many of these verses are citations from ancient Greek works and aim to add to the comic atmosphere of the dialogue. A good example is the dialogue between Homer and his buyer about where he comes from, with a serial alternation between prose and quotations from Homer and a hexametric passage from the *Greek Anthology* (all metrical parts are indicated in bold type):<sup>35</sup>

ΑΓ. Ἄγε οὖν, ὦ γέρον, εἰπέ· πόθεν ἔφυς καὶ τί σοι τὸ γένος καὶ τίς ἡ πατρίς;

ΟΜ. **Οὐ τοι ἀποκρινοῦμαι ἀραψωδήτῳ ἐόντι.**

ΑΓ. Σὺ δὲ ἀλλὰ πρὸς τοῦ ἔπους δίδαξόν με, πῶς καὶ ἔχρῃν ἐρηροτηκέναι.

ΟΜ. **Τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν; πόθι τοι πόλις ἡδὲ τοκῆς;** [cf. *Od.* 1.170]

33 For the text see E. Cullhed in P. Marciniak, *Taniec w roli Tersytyesa: Studia nad satyrą bizantyńską* [A Dance in the Role of Thersites: Studies on Byzantine Satire] (Katowice, 2016), 185–203.

34 P. Marciniak, “Theodore Prodrōmos’ *Bion Prasis*: A Reappraisal,” *GRBS* 53 (2013): 219.

35 Prodrōmos, *Bion Prasis*, ed. Cullhed, 189, 28.1–33.1; trans. in M. J. Kyriakis, “Trial and Tribulations of a Man of Letters in Twelfth-Century Constantinople: Theodoros Prodrōmos and his Adversities,” *Δίπτυχα Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν καὶ Μεταβυζαντινῶν Μελετητῶν* 4 (1986–87): 58–93, at 65 (with modifications).

ΑΓ. Καὶ δὴ νόμισον οὕτω γέ σου πυθέσθαι καὶ  
ὄθεν ἔφυς εἰπέ.

ΟΜ. Ἐπτα πόλεις μάρνανθ' ἱερὴν διὰ ρίζαν ἐμείο·  
**Σμύρνα, Χίος, Κολοφών, Ἰθάκη, Πύλος,**  
**Ἄργος, Ἀθήνη.**<sup>36</sup>

Buyer: Come on then, O old man, tell us where  
you were born, what is your origin and your  
country?

Homer: **I will not answer you because you are  
not able to speak in epic verse!**

Buyer: Teach me then how I should pose the  
question in epic verse.

Homer: **Who are you among men, and from  
whence? Where is your city and  
where are your parents?**

Buyer: Suppose, then, that I asked you in this  
manner and speak of your origin.

Homer: Seven cities quarrel for my sacred roots  
of origin:

**Smyrna, Chios, Kolophon, Ithaca,  
Pylos, Argos and Athens.**

However, it should be stressed that in this passage  
Homer's reply to his potential purchaser's question  
about his origin is not a quotation, but a verse written  
by Prodnromos himself.<sup>37</sup> There are even more verses in  
*Bion Prasis* that are not mere Homeric citations:<sup>38</sup>

ΑΓ. Εὐκτὰ μὲν καὶ ταῦτα· καὶ τί γὰρ ἄλλο ἢ  
ποιητικὰ ἀγαθὰ; Πλὴν ἄλλ' ἐγὼ σε, ὦ θεσπέσιε  
Ὅμηρε, τοῦτο πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἐροίμην ἄν· τί  
ποτέ σοι τὸ ποικίλον τοῦ μέτρου βούλεται καὶ  
ἔστιν οὐ μὴ πρὸς ἑαυτὸ συνωδόν, ὡς ἐγὼ οὐκ  
ἔστιν <εἰπεῖν> ὅσα καὶ ἐκκεκώφωμαι ὑπὸ τῶν  
ἀλαστόρων γραμματικῶν, λαγαρούς τινας καὶ  
προκεφάλους καὶ τοὺς οὐκ οἶδ' εἴ τινες ἄν καὶ εἶεν  
μειούρους ψυχρολογούντων;

36 Cf. W. R. Paton, ed., *The Greek Anthology with an English Translation*, vol. 5 (Cambridge, MA, 1918; 6th reprint, 1979), 16, nos. 297–98.

37 He even makes use of the hapax legomenon ἀραψώδης, which does not appear in any lexicon.

38 Prodnromos, *Bion Prasis*, ed. Cullhed, 191, 45.1–50.1; trans. in Kyriakis, "Trial and Tribulations," 66–67 (with major modifications).

ΟΜ. Οὐ μὰ γὰρ Ἀπόλλωνα Διὶ φίλον,<sup>39</sup> οὐ  
συνῆμι

τί ποτε ἄρα καὶ λέγουσι τὰ ὀνόματα.

ΑΓ. Παίξεις ἔχων· τὸ μέντοι

**Τρώες δ' ἐρρίγησαν ἐπεὶ ἴδον αἰδόν  
ὄφιν.** [cf. *Il.* 12.208]

ἢ μὴν καὶ διόμνυνται μείουρον εἶναι οἱ γενναι-  
ότατοι τῶν γραμματικῶν.

ΟΜ. Αἱ γὰρ Ζεῦ τε πάτερ καὶ Ἀθηναίη καὶ  
Ἀπολλόν· [cf. *Il.* 4.288]

**εἰ μείουρον ἔγνωκα μὴ οὔρος ἐμοὶ φορὸς  
ἄοι.**

**πλήθει δ' ἐμπελάων ἐσθλούς τε κακούς  
τε νοήσεις.**

ΑΓ. Οἱ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας δάκτυλοι καὶ τὰ πέπλα πόθεν  
οἱ μὲν ῥοδόεντες, τὰ δέ σοι κροκόεντα ἐξεφάνησαν,  
τὴν τῶν χρωμάτων ἀντιληπτικὴν ἔξιν ἀνενέρ-  
γητον ἔχοντι, διὰ τὴν αἰσθητηρίου πηρότητα;

ΟΜ. Οὐ γὰρ μοι βρεφόθεν δνοφερὴ νύξ ὅσσε  
κάλυπεν

**ἠέλιον τ' ἔδρακον καὶ ῥοδοδάκτυλον ἠῶ.**

Buyer: These things are also desirable! For what  
else are they if not poetic goods? However, above  
all, I would like to ask you this, O Homer with  
the divinely sweet voice: Why do you prefer  
such a varied versification, which sometimes is  
not in harmony with itself? So I am often deaf-  
ened by the malicious grammarians, who speak  
nonsense about the thin-waist [λαγαρούς],  
with prefixed syllables [προκεφάλους], tapering  
[μειούρους] verses, even though I don't know if  
they exist.

Homer: **No by Apollo, dear to Zeus! I  
[myself] don't understand what  
the meaning of these terms is.**

Buyer: You must be joking! Certainly the noblest  
grammarians would swear that the verse

**"And the Trojans shuddered when  
they saw the writhing snake"**  
misses a syllable.

Homer: **O father Zeus and Athene and  
Apollo! If I knew it was a tapering  
verse may I not have a favorable**

39 Perhaps "Διὶ φίλον" should be emended to "διίφιλον"; cf. ps.-Dionysius, *Art of Rhetoric*, 9.7.86: οὐ μὰ γὰρ Ἀπόλλωνα διίφιλον, ὦ τε σύ, Κάλχαν.

wind.<sup>40</sup> But you will distinguish  
the good from bad when you  
approach this multitude of verses.

Buyer: And the fingers of the day and tunics?  
How is it possible that the former appear to you  
rosy-colored and the latter saffron-colored, if  
your perception of eyes is inoperative, because  
of your visual disability?

Homer: **The dark night did not cover my eyes  
when I was young; I saw the sun  
and the rosy-fingered dawn.**

Here, the buyer and Homer talk about various aspects of his hexametric poetry and his ability to describe colors, despite his blindness. Two verses are taken from Homer, while the remaining five are Prodromic. It is worth noting that the first sentence uttered by Homer is a skillful combination of hexameter and prose within a single sentence. Hence, even though most of the verses introduced in the work are taken from the works of other authors, they are used creatively for the needs of the comic dialogue, resulting in an elaborate collage of prose and verse.

Besides Makrembolites' and Prodromos's experiments in the genres of novel and satire, there is yet another very interesting group of twelfth-century texts in which prose and verse are mixed together: *schede*.<sup>41</sup> Many of these texts consist of a rather short prose text followed by a verse section. Occasionally, the verse part

could be placed before the prose one, and there are even schede that both open and close with verses. Follieri has rightly argued that schedography should not constitute a case of prosimetrum because the versified prologues or epilogues have usually a paratextual function.<sup>42</sup> There are, however, quite a few schedographical works in which the verse part constitutes more than a mere paratext. The manuscript Vaticanus Palatinus graecus 92, which was most probably produced in Salento,<sup>43</sup> contains numerous schede in which prose is combined with a verse epilogue for the sake of the narrative. To give but an example: an anonymous antistoichic schedos concerned with the life of Saint Anthony the Great concludes with a dodecasyllable (with a caesura after the fifth syllable and without any prosodic errors):<sup>44</sup>

Ὁ μέγας Ἀντώνιος ἐξ ὀνύχων τὸν ἀσκητικὸν  
ἀπαλῶν βίον μετελθὼν καὶ τὴν ὀρειφοῖτιν βιοτὴν  
ἀσπασάμενος καὶ πᾶν τῷ<sup>45</sup> Θεῷ φίλον διαπραξά-  
μενος εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν<sup>46</sup> ἀνῆι καὶ μετηνέχθη τὴν  
αἰδίου κατοικίαν· καὶ τὴν ἀγήρω ζωὴν εἰληφώς  
τῶν τοῦ παραδείσου ἐπαπολαύει εἰδέων καὶ χαίρει  
διόλου ὁρῶν τὸ ἀνέσπερον καὶ καλὸν<sup>47</sup> φῶς τῆς  
ἀγίας τριάδος

καὶ συγγορεύει τοῖς χοροῖς τῶν ἀγγέλων.

40 Note the wordplay between “μείουρον” and “μὴ οὖρος,” which reminds us of the contemporary practice of antistoichic sound plays in schedography described by Eustathios of Thessalonike; see P. Agapitos, “Literary Haute Cuisine and Its Dangers: Eustathios of Thessalonike on Schedography and Everyday Language,” *DOP* 69 (2015): 225–41.

41 For extensive literature on schedography see P. Agapitos, “Grammar, Genre and Patronage in the Twelfth Century: Redefining a Scientific Paradigm in the History of Byzantine Literature,” *JÖB* 64 (2014): 1–22, at 2 n. 4. For discussions of schedography from various angles see also idem, “Anna Komnene and the Politics of Schedographic Training and Colloquial Discourse,” *Nea Rhome* 10 (2013 [2014]): 89–107; idem, “Literary Haute Cuisine and its Dangers,” 225–41; idem, “New Genres in the Twelfth Century: The Schedourgia of Theodore Prodromos,” *Medioevo Greco* 15 (2015): 1–41; idem, “Learning to Read and Write a Schedos: The Verse Dictionary of Par. Gr. 400,” in “*Pour une poétique de Byzance: Hommage à Vassilis Katsaros*,” ed. S. Efthymiadis, P. Odorico, and I. D. Polemis (Paris, 2015), 11–24; idem, “John Tzertzes and the Blemish Examiner: A Byzantine Teacher on Schedography, Everyday Language and Writerly Disposition,” *Medioevo Greco* 17 (2017): 1–57.

42 Follieri, “Per l’identificazione,” 404.

43 D. Arnesano, *La minuscula “barocca”: Scritture e libri in Terra d’Otranto nei secoli XIII e XIV* (Galatina and Congedo, 2008), 78. On the other hand, Polemis has argued that the manuscript was produced in Epirus; see I. D. Polemis, “Μία υπόθεση για τὴν προέλευση τῆς σχεδογραφικῆς συλλογῆς τοῦ κώδικα Vaticanus Palatinus graecus 92,” in *Αντιφίλησις: Studies on Classical, Byzantine and Modern Greek Literature and Culture; in Honour of John-Theophanes A. Papademetriou*, ed. E. Karamalengou and E. D. Makrygianni (Stuttgart, 2009), 558–65.

44 I have consulted both the manuscript and the edition offered in G. J. Sánchez, “*Η σχεδογραφία τοῦ 12<sup>ου</sup> αἰῶνα: Ἀνέκδοτα κείμενα ἀπὸ τὸν κώδικα Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 92*” (master’s thesis, Thessalonike, 2015), 9 and 60. Moreover, Ioannis Polemis has kindly informed me that he is working together with I. Vassis on a critical edition of the schedographical collection of the entire manuscript. For more examples of schede with similar structure see I. Vassis, “*Τῶν νέων φιλολόγων παλαισμάτα: Ἡ συλλογὴ σχεδῶν τοῦ κώδικα Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 92*,” *Hellenika* 52 (2002): 37–68, e.g., nos. 18, 21, 25, 27, 34, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 49, 53, 71, 83, 90, 91.

45 The manuscript reads τὸ.

46 The manuscript reads τῶν οὐρανῶν.

47 The manuscript reads καλλῶν.



Anthony the Great from a tender age assumed the ascetic habit and embraced the mountain-roaming life, and in having done everything according to God's will, he went up to heaven and was transferred to the eternal dwelling-place; and having received the Immortal Life, he is pleased at the sight of paradise and fully rejoices in seeing the good and never-setting light of the Holy Trinity

and dances together with the choirs of angels.

What is more, the practice of supplementing a prose text with a verse ending even occurs in contemporary letter-writing practice. There are three letters, all by John Tzetzes, with short iambic epilogues of a varying number of verses.<sup>48</sup> For example, Tzetzes' letter 1, a full-fledged polemic addressed to the deacon Epiphanius, who was the nephew of the metropolitan of Side, ends with an iambic poem of seven verses:<sup>49</sup>

ἀνέξομαι γάρ, εὖ ἴσθι, οὐδαμῶς τοιαῦτα ἀκούειν.  
οὐ γὰρ ἐμὸς πέφυκε ταρβήμων νόος,  
οὐδ' ἀχαριτόγλωττός εἰμι πρὸς λόγους,  
ἀλλ' οἶδα νωμᾶν εὐφυῶς τὴν ἀσπίδα,  
οἶδα κραδαίνειν δεξιῶς ἄγαν δόρυ,  
ἐλῶ τὸν ἵππον, οὐ πέφρικα τὸν κτύπον,  
τῇ συστάδην γέγηθα τῶν ἄλλων πλέον,  
καὶ τόξα τείνων οὐ πτοοῦμαι τὰς μάχας.

Be certain that I won't tolerate to hear such things;

for my mind wasn't born to be fearful, nor  
am I without any grace in the logoi, but I  
know to handle my shield skillfully, I know  
to wave the spear very well. I ride the horse,  
the rattling noise doesn't scare me, I rejoice  
more in close combat than other things, and I  
stretch my bow, I am not afraid of the battles!

Despite Tzetzes' critique against the novel type of schedography that emerged in the twelfth century,<sup>50</sup> the

way he combines prose with verse clearly recalls the technique employed by contemporary schedographers. Of course it would be far-fetched to claim that the schedos on the life of St. Anthony and Tzetzes' letter display prosimetric qualities, but it is clear that the concluding parts are not paratextual. On the contrary, they are an indispensable part of the narrative of the remaining text, in terms of both syntax and content.

If we now shift our focus from Constantinople to southern Italy, which in the twelfth century demonstrates an unprecedented production of literature in both verse and prose,<sup>51</sup> we encounter an even more conspicuous case of mixing prose with verse than all the works discussed so far. The early twelfth-century grammarian Leo the Sicilian wrote in the mixed form two hagiographical encomia on SS. Nektarios and James the Greater,<sup>52</sup> respectively. The former work includes 102 dodecasyllables introduced at various places in the prose narrative, from the prologue to the end of the text (a total of more than 18 pages).<sup>53</sup> The number of verses of each incorporated stanza varies (from a single verse up to 18). For example, while the prose work concludes with a grand total of 18 dodecasyllables that describe two miracles by Nektarios during his burial,<sup>54</sup> the description of St. Nektarios's rise to the patriarchal see of Constantinople consists of chunks of prose together with monostichs that are mutually dependent:<sup>55</sup>

Ἦ δὲ προπομπὴ πόθεν καὶ ποῦ καὶ ἵνα τί; Ἀπὸ  
τῆς παλαιᾶς Εἰρήνης, τοῦ πρώτου δηλονότι  
πατριαρχείου καλουμένου τῆς Εἰρήνης ἦτοι τοῦ  
σωτήρος, ἐπὶ τὸν νέον τῆς Σοφίας νεών, τὸ καινὸν

48 John Tzetzes, *Letters* 1, 9, and 106, ed. P. A. M. Leone, *Ioannis Tzetzæ epistulae* (Leipzig, 1972).

49 Ibid., 1, 4, lines 6–13.

50 Agapitos, "Grammar," 12–13 and idem, "John Tzetzes."

51 As has been noted in Lauxtermann, "Tomi, Mljet, Malta," 171 and A. Acconica Longo, "La letteratura italogreca nell'XI e XII secolo," in *Byzantino-Sicula VI: La Sicilia e Bisanzio nei secoli XI e XII; Atti delle X Giornate di Studio della Associazione Italiana di Studi Bizantini* (Palermo, 27–28 Maggio 2011), ed. R. Lavagnini and C. Rognoni (Palermo, 2014), 107–30.

52 E. Follieri, "Per l'identificazione del grammatikòs Leone Siculo con Leone da Centirupe," *RSBN* 24 (1987): 127–41; repr. in eadem, *Byzantina et Italograeca: Studi di filologia e di paleografia*, ed. A. Acconica Longo, L. Perria, and A. Luzzi (Rome, 1997), 399–411.

53 F. Halkin, "L'éloge du patriarche S. Nectaire par Léon de Sicile (BHG 2284)," *RSBN* 22–23 (1985–86): 171–89. Unfortunately, the edition abounds with mistakes and inaccurate readings.

54 Leo the Sicilian, *Encomium on St. Nektarios*, ed. Halkin, 189.

55 Ibid., 181.

ἐνδιαίτημα, ἵν' ἐθρονίσῃ τὸν μέγαν Νεκτάριον,  
καὶ ἵν' ἐπὶ τοιαύτης ὡς δέον λυχνίας

οὕτως αἰγλήεν ἐπιθήσειε φάος,

ὡς φωτιεῖ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην· καὶ ἡ συνέλευ-  
σις ἐκ διαφόρων ἰδεῶν σύμμικτος ἡλικιῶν τε καὶ  
ἐπιτηδευμάτων. Σκοπὸς δὲ τῶν συνειλεγμένων ὁ  
αὐτός· τὸν ἄνδρα προπέμπειν ἢ τιμᾶν ὅση δύνα-  
μις. Θροῦς δὲ οὐκ ἄσημος ἐξ ἀπάντων ἡκούετο·  
μᾶλλον δὲ

χεῖλος ἔν, φωνὴ μία πᾶσι καὶ γνώμη

.....

Where does the procession come from and  
whither [does it go] and for what reason?  
From the old [church of] Irene, namely the old  
patriarchal church called [that] of Irene or of  
the Savior, to the new [patriarchal] church of  
Sophia, the new building, in order to enthrone  
Nektarios the great, it is necessary that

the radiant light be placed in a lampstand

to light the entire world; and the assembly is a  
mixture of different appearances, ages and ways  
of life. The aim of all the gathered people is the  
same; to escort the man or to honor him with  
all their power. A not indistinct noise was heard  
from them all, or rather

one mouth, one voice and opinion

.....

The other mixed work of Leo the Grammarian remains,  
unfortunately, still unedited, except for some passages  
published by Follieri.<sup>56</sup> However, its structure and the  
alternation of verse and prose seem to operate in a very  
similar way. For instance, toward the end of the work  
on St. James, where we are told that the bloodied body  
of the saint has a miraculous power, prose and verse  
alternate in a continuous flow, and the verse cannot  
stand on its own as independent poetry.<sup>57</sup>

Καὶ ὅσοι πάθουσιν ἀνιάτοις συνέιχοντο, εὐσυμπα-  
θεστάτη ψυχῇ, μόνον εἰ τύχοιεν ῥανίδος αἵματος

ἢ τῶν ἁγίων ἐκείνων σαρκῶν βραχέος τμήματος  
εὐθὺς ἰᾶτο

νόσου παντοίας καὶ δαιμονώδους βλάβης . . .

And those who suffered incurable diseases, if  
only they touched a drop of his blood or a small  
part of his holy flesh would be healed right away  
by his most compassionate soul

from every kind of disease and demonic  
possession . . .

By now it has become clear that in the twelfth century,  
the mixing of prose and verse for the composition of  
a single work occurred in a wide range of genres, for  
example novel, satire, hagiography, schedography, and  
epistolography, both in Constantinople and southern  
Italy. The main question that emerges from this discus-  
sion, however, is whether the structure of these works is  
associated with the practice of prosimetrum.

As far as Makrembolites' and Prodromos' works are concerned, Marc Lauxtermann has rightly  
noted that "the occasional use of verse in prose text  
is in itself very interesting but it does not constitute  
prosimetrum."<sup>58</sup> Additionally, it should be stressed  
that the driving forces behind the juxtaposition of prose  
and verse differ in the capital and the periphery and  
across various literary genres. Leo's experimentation  
with prose and verse should be seen in the light of the  
popularity of prosimetrum in Latin since the time of  
Boethius and the influence of Latin literary culture on  
many of the poets who were active in Sicily and other  
parts of southern Italy.<sup>59</sup> On the other hand, the reasons  
for mixing prose with verse in Constantinople varied.  
Both Makrembolites and Prodromos occasionally seem  
to appropriate the skeleton of their ancient models,

58 Lauxtermann, "Tomi, Mljet, Malta," 173.

59 See *ibid.* However, the phenomenon of mixing prose with  
verse is not completely alien to the Greek hagiographical tradition  
either. Although it does not constitute a case of prosimetrum, we  
come across a mixture of prose and verse in the first part of the life  
of Epiphanius of Salamis (BHG 596–99) written sometime in the  
fifth or sixth century; see C. Rapp, "Frühbyzantinische Dichtung  
und Hagiographie am Beispiel der Vita des Epiphanius von Zypern,"  
*RSBN* 27 (1990): 3–31. What is more, in his early twelfth-century  
prose life of Saint Cyril of Philea, Nicholas Kataskepenos introduced  
a verse prayer; see E. Sargologos, *La vie de Saint Cyrille le Philéote,  
moine byzantin (†1110)* (Brussels, 1964), 71–72, 83.2–26.

56 Follieri, "Per l'identificazione," 402–3.

57 *Ibid.*, 403.

which quite often constitute a mixture of prose and verse,<sup>60</sup> while on other occasions this symbiosis seems to reflect an experimentation on the part of the author (e.g. the insertion of two epithalamia in *Amarantos* by Prodromos). In either case, by doing so, Makrembolites succeeds in conveying a more credible image of the wall paintings in the garden of Sosthenes, while Prodromos strengthens the satiric and comic effects of his works. As to the mixing of prose and verse in many schedographical works, this is a much more complicated issue, and of course cannot be determined with the study of a single schedos. However, it seems that schedography and poetry were very similar in composition, as both were part of the early stages of Byzantine education. It is therefore likely that the mixed form was a way to teach students the composition of both prose and verse.<sup>61</sup>

All in all, the mixing of prose and verse operates in different ways in terms of purpose, variety, and quantity: Prodromos and Makrembolites make use of a small number of poems, single verses, and quite a number of quotations borrowed from ancient Greek poetry; the writers of schedes insert a very small number of verses (either before or after the prose part); John Tzetzes exclusively adds some short poems at the very end of his letters; and Leo the Sicilian includes numerous blocks of verses at various points in his works. Whereas most of the other authors write in dodecasyllables, Prodromos makes use of hexameters, elegiac couplets, and anacronics. Whereas in Leo the Sicilian's works the mixture is very conspicuous and arguably the closest that Greek literary culture came to the prosimetrum, in the Constantinopolitan works the mixture is subtler and

cannot be labeled as prosimetric per se.<sup>62</sup> That said, all of these twelfth-century texts can be grouped under the umbrella term “mixed works,” since they bear witness to the synergy of verse and prose within the same work. As will be argued in the next section, however, in the twelfth century we witness a synergy of prose and verse not only within a single work, but also among a set of seemingly separate works.

### Reconciling Prose with Verse and Schedography: “Diptychs” and “Triptychs”

Νικόλαε, φρούρει με συνήθως πάλιν·  
οἶδας, πνέω σε, μαρτύρων οὐ προσδέη·  
κανικλείου, ῥύου με συνήθως πάλιν·  
οἶδας, φιλῶ σε, μαρτύρων οὐ προσδέη·  
αὐτοκράτορ κράτιστε, βλαστὲ πορφύρας  
(σὲ γὰρ ἐπισφράγισμα ποιῶ τοῦ λόγου),  
νίκα τὸν ἐχθρόν, ὅστις ἀντάρωτό σοι,  
  
μέμνησο τῆς σῆς προδρομικῆς ἐστίας  
καὶ Νικολάου συμμαχοῦντος εὐτύχει.<sup>63</sup>

Nicholas, protect me again as always; you know that you are my life, no proof is necessary. Imperial secretary, save me again as always; you know that I regard you with affection, no proof is necessary. Most powerful emperor, purple-born—for I make you the concluding seal of my work—triumph over the enemies who have risen up against you, remember the house of your Prodromos and may you fare well with Nicholas as ally.

This poem is the closing part of a prose schedos (another example of supplementing a prose work with verse) that is an encomium on and a prayer to St. Nicholas. In the poem Prodromos addresses the saint and asks Theodore Styppeiotes, a former student of his and the

60 For the mixture of prose and verse in Lucian see Bartoňková, “Prosimetrum,” 70–76 and Pabst, *Prosimetrum*, 1:73–84. For the novel see Bartoňková, “Prosimetrum,” 75–76 and Pabst, *Prosimetrum*, 1:85. Achilles Tatius in *Leucippe and Clitophon*, which is extensively used as a model by Makrembolites, includes a good deal of material taken from ancient Greek poetry (e.g. *L & C* 1, 8.2).

61 Moreover, it probably represents the transition from schedography to the composition of poetry. For example, Nicholas Mesarites, in the epitaph for his brother John, claims that John started writing poetry after having fully learned the art of schedography: A. Heisenberg, *Der Epitaphios des Nikolaos Mesarites auf seinen Bruder Johannes*, in *Neue Quellen zur Geschichte des lateinischen Kaisertums und der Kirchenunion*, vol. 1, Sb. Bayer. Ak., phil.-hist. Kl. 1922 (Munich, 1922), 5, 16–72, 28.15: Ἦν μὲν οὖν τὰ τῆς σχεδογραφίας ἐμμελετῶν τελεώτερα ἀκμαιότερόν τε καὶ συντονώτερον. ἔαρ κινούν εἰς ἰαμβεῖα ὡς εἰς τὰς ᾠδὰς τὰ στρουθία τοὺς τῶν παιδῶν μουσικωτέρους.

62 As has already been argued in Lauxtermann, “Tomi, Mljet, Malta,” 173.

63 Prodromos, *Schedos* 1, ed. I. Vassis, “Graeca sunt, non leguntur: Zu den schedographischen Spielereien des Theodoros Prodromos,” *BZ* 86–87 (1993–94): 16.

imperial secretary of Manuel Komnenos,<sup>64</sup> to rescue him once again from his dreadful poverty. Moreover, Prodromos wishes the emperor to triumph over the barbaric enemies of the empire, but also to remember his Prodromos. Clearly this is not a work written for Prodromos's students but, like a substantial portion of his poetry, it is associated with the court.<sup>65</sup> Even more interesting is the fact that this is not the only time that Prodromos addresses Theodore Styppieotes asking for help; in a poem written in ninety-nine political verses, he asks Styppieotes for news about the struggles of the emperor against the barbaric enemies in order to compose new encomiastic orations, while in a poem of forty-two dodecasyllables (poem 72 in Hörandner's edition) he asks Styppieotes to save him from his poverty. First of all, it is worth emphasizing that these three works addressed to Styppieotes are written in different forms: they consist of a schedos and two poems in political verse and dodecasyllable. Secondly, the schedos strongly resembles the content and function of the second epistolary poem addressed to Theodore Styppieotes, since both ask him to help the unfortunate sick and poor poet.<sup>66</sup>

Were the schedos and the iambic epistolary poem sent at different times or together? In my view, there is good reason to believe that the latter is possible. As with the Latin literary trend of *opus geminatum*—the practice of writing a work into two forms, one in prose, the other in verse<sup>67</sup>—the composition of twinned

works (in prose and verse) or even tripartite works (in prose, verse, and schedography) for the very same occasion seems to have flourished in twelfth-century Byzantium. Ioannis Vassis was the first scholar to notice that Prodromos composed triptychs,<sup>68</sup> while more recently Panagiotis Agapitos argued that triptychs were part of Prodromos's literary performative *schedourgia*.<sup>69</sup> According to both of them, Prodromos seems to have produced such multicompositional works for three purposes: (a) to praise someone, (b) to commemorate a death, and (c) to praise an imperial victory.

Although there are no surviving examples of the last group, from one of his poems sent to Theodore Styppieotes we can deduce that Prodromos composed triplets of works celebrating the triumphs of the Komnenian emperors.<sup>70</sup> On the other hand, parts of these multicompositional works for the first two occasions do survive. For instance, at the very beginning of a verse encomium written in 1141 for the *orphantrophos* Alexios Aristenos,<sup>71</sup> Prodromos explicitly says ὑμνησάμην σε πρῶτα πεζῷ τῷ λόγῳ . . . ἐμελψάμην σε δεύτερον σχεδουργίᾳ ("First, I praised you with prose discourse . . . | then, I celebrated you with schedourgia . . .").<sup>72</sup> The poem is thus a part of a triple composition; the schedos that was written in praise of Aristenos does not survive, but this may not be so for the prose part. Three prose orations directed to Aristenos are extant, any of which could potentially be the prose discourse that Prodromos refers

64 Before falling out of imperial favor; see O. Kresten, "Zum Sturz des Theodoros Styppieotes," *JÖB* 27 (1978): 49–103 and V. Koufopoulou, "Δύο ἀνέκδοτα ποιήματα για τον γιο του Θεοδώρου Στυππιώτη," *Βυζαντινά* 15 (1989): 355.

65 As is well known, sometime in the twelfth century schedography was transformed from a mere teaching exercise into a separate literary "genre," assuming the functions and modes of contemporary panegyric discourse and becoming a playful "board game" for the court; see Vassis, "Graeca sunt," 13. More recently, N. Zagklas, "Theodore Prodromos: The Neglected Poems and Epigrams (Edition, Translation, and Commentary)" (PhD diss., University of Vienna, 2014), 73–87 and Agapitos, "Schedourgia of Theodore Prodromos," 14 (n. 41 above).

66 See also Vassis, "Graeca sunt," 12.

67 E. Walter, "Opus geminum: Untersuchungen zu einem Formtyp in der mittellateinischen Literatur" (Diss. phil., Erlangen, 1973); P. Godman, "The Anglo-Latin Opus Geminatum: From Aldhelm to Alcuin," *Medium Aevum* 50, no. 2 (1981): 215–29; G. Wieland, "Geminus Stilus: Studies in Anglo-Latin Hagiography," in *Insular Latin Studies: Papers on Latin Texts and Manuscripts of the British Isles, 550–1066*, ed. M. W. Herren (Toronto, 1981), 113–33; B. Friesen,

"The Opus Geminatum and Anglo-Saxon Literature," *Neophilologus* 95 (2011): 123–44; M. C. Ferrari, "Opus Geminum," in *Dichten als Stoff-Vermittlung: Formen, Ziele, Wirkungen; Beiträge zur Praxis der Versifikation lateinischer Texte im Mittelalter*, ed. P. Stotz (Zurich, 2008), 247–64.

68 Ibid., 12–14. This technique was also noted by W. Hörandner, "Musterautoren und ihre Nachahmer: Indizien für Elemente einer byzantinischen Poetik," in Odorico, Agapitos, and Hinterberger, "Doux Remède," 207.

69 Agapitos, "Schedourgia of Theodore Prodromos," 17–20.

70 This can be deduced from two points of the poem: Hörandner, *Theodoros Prodromos* 71, vv. 16–17 and 65–73; for a translation and discussion see Zagklas, *Theodore Prodromos*, 75 and Agapitos, "Schedourgia of Theodore Prodromos," 16–17.

71 Hörandner, *Theodoros Prodromos* 467; see also the online database "Prosopography of the Byzantine World" (s.v. Alexios Aristenos).

72 Prodromos, *Historical Poem* 56, ed. Hörandner, 461, vv. 9–10; trans. in Agapitos, "Schedourgia of Theodore Prodromos," 19.



to.<sup>73</sup> As with the poem, the three prose orations stress Aristenos's broad education and eloquence, and celebrate his service in both the religious and the legal sphere. One of them, however, appears to be very close to the poem for two reasons. First, both works were written on the occasion of Alexios Aristenos's return from Thessaly to Constantinople to receive the title of *orphanotrophos* for the second time.<sup>74</sup> Second, in Vaticanus graecus 305, which is the most important witness to the Prodroomic oeuvre,<sup>75</sup> these two particular works are preserved very close together: the prose discourse is on fol. 36<sup>r</sup>–38<sup>v</sup>, while the poem follows on 39<sup>r</sup>–40<sup>v</sup> (there is only a letter addressed to Alexios between the two works).

Another example from Prodroimos's works that shows both the literary evolution of schedography and how it was used consecutively with prose and verse is a schedos commemorating the death of the *sebastokrator* Andronikos, son of Alexios I Komnenos and Irene Doukaina.<sup>76</sup> Apart from the schedos, the author had produced a prose monody, performed in front of the deceased *sebastokrator*,<sup>77</sup> as well as a hexametric poem of consolation for Irene Doukaina.<sup>78</sup> Although

they serve slightly different functions,<sup>79</sup> both the prose monody and the poem of consolation praise the graces and military merits of the dead *sebastokrator*. Moreover, the vocabulary and motifs are very similar; for example, both works use the Homeric allegory of the diamond: the monody for Andronikos's military steadfastness,<sup>80</sup> and the poem of consolation for Irene Doukaina's steadfastness after the loss of her beloved son.<sup>81</sup> Similarly, in the schedos Prodroimos notes that the glory and the power of an imperial individual are due not to the possession of worldly goods, such as gold and pearls, but to his military merits and benevolence, which the deceased *sebastokrator* possessed in full. The empress, Prodroimos says, suffered yet another loss after that of her husband and her daughter-in-law, Andronikos's wife. The schedos then concludes with a poem of three hexametric verses addressed to Doukaina. More importantly, halfway through the text, Prodroimos also writes *Καὶ ὁ λόγος χθὲς γεγωνὼς ἡμῖν τρανωθήσεται* ("And the speeches delivered yestertide will now be explained by me").<sup>82</sup> This is a very helpful notice, since it suggests that the prose oration and the hexametric poem were delivered first, and the schedos was sent the following day as a clarification of their content.

In addition to these two examples, both of which have been identified and discussed,<sup>83</sup> there is another pair of texts with a similar purpose and function. In particular, Prodroimos addressed to John Komnenos's younger brother Isaac a prose discourse<sup>84</sup> and a poem of sixty-one hexameters<sup>85</sup> on an unspecified occasion and date. The themes of the encomium are by and large identical in both texts, with a special focus on Isaac's

73 Prodroimos, *Orations* 31–33, ed. M. D. J. Op de Coul, "Théodore Prodrome: Lettres et discours; édition, traduction, commentaire," vols. 1–2 (PhD diss., Paris-Sorbonne University, 2007), 1, 173–208 (= PG 133:1241–48, 1258–68, 1268–74).

74 Whereas the poem is entitled "Τῷ πρωτεκδίκῳ καὶ νομοφύλακι κυρῷ Ἀλεξίῳ τῷ Ἀριστηνῷ δις τὴν τοῦ ὀρφανοτρόφου ἀξίαν λαμβάνοντι," the prose oration is "Τοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰσιτήριος τῷ ὀρφανοτρόφῳ, πρωτεκδίκῳ καὶ νομοφύλακι δις τὴν τοῦ ὀρφανοτρόφου ἀξίαν λαμβάνοντι" (Prodroimos, *Oration* 33, ed. Op de Coul, 198 = PG 133:1268–74). By contrast, the other two prose discourses were written when Alexios was *orphanotrophos*, but not to celebrate this particular event. This is clear from their titles: "Τοῦ αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστήριος τῷ νομοφύλακι, πρωτεκδίκῳ καὶ ὀρφανοτρόφῳ κυρῷ Ἀλεξίῳ τῷ Ἀριστηνῷ" and "Τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ τῆς γλώττης τοῦ ὀρφανοτρόφου καὶ νομοφύλακος κυροῦ Ἀλεξίου τοῦ Ἀριστηνοῦ"; Prodroimos, *Orations* 31 and 32, ed. Op de Coul, 173 and 184 (PG 133:1241–48, 1258–68), respectively.

75 For a recent study of the manuscript with detailed literature see Zagklas, *Theodore Prodromos*, 137–45.

76 Prodroimos, *Schedos* 2, ed. Vassis, 18–19.

77 Prodroimos, *Oration* 35, ed. Op de Coul, 224–31 (= A. Maiuri, "Anecdota Prodromea dal Vat. Gr. 305," *RendLinc* 5, 17 (1908): 521–28).

78 Prodroimos, *Historical Poem* 2, ed. Hörandner, 185–88; see A. Sideras, *Die byzantinischen Grabreden: Prosopographie, Datierung, Überlieferung. 142 Epitaphien und Monodien aus dem byzantinischen Jahrtausend* (Vienna, 1994), 157.

79 As already noted in Agapitos, "Schedourgia of Theodore Prodromos," 18.

80 Prodroimos, *Oration* 35, ed. Op de Coul, 230–31, lines 179–80: σιδηρὸς δὲ ποῖος τὸν σιδηροῦν καὶ ἀδάμαντα στρατιώτην ἔκαμψεν ἢ ἐδάμασεν (= Maiuri, "Anecdota Prodromea," 528, lines 7–8).

81 Prodroimos, *Historical Poem* 2, ed. Hörandner, 187, vv. 60–68.

82 Prodroimos, *Schedos* 2, ed. Vassis, 19.

83 In the studies of both Vassis, "Graeca sunt" (n. 63 above) and Agapitos, "Schedourgia of Theodore Prodromos."

84 Prodroimos, *Oration* 34, ed. Op de Coul, 209–16 (= E. Kurtz, "Unedierte Texte aus der Zeit des Kaisers Johannes Komnenos," *BZ* 16 [1907]: 112–17).

85 Prodroimos, *Historical Poem* 42, ed. Hörandner, 396–98.

impressive learning.<sup>86</sup> Even the imagery employed by the poet is strikingly similar:

ἐκεῖθεν δέ σοι περὶ τὸ οὐς ἡ φρόνησις ἐπικύψασα  
ὑποτίθεσθαι δοκεῖ τὸ δέον ἐν συμβουλίαις· καὶ  
τῇ μὲν ἡ δικαιοσύνη μετὰ τῆς τρυτάνης καὶ τοῦ  
ζυγοῦ καὶ τῆς φιλῆς ἰσορροπίας παρίσταται, τῇ δὲ  
ἡ σωφροσύνη μετὰ τῆς ὥχρας καὶ τῆς σεμνότητος  
θαυμαστῶ τινι ζωστῇρι τὴν ὁσφὺν περιζώννυσι·  
καὶ ὧδε μὲν ἡ γραμματικὴ μετὰ τῶν διαλέκτων  
αὐτῆς καὶ τῶν ἐτυμολογιῶν καὶ τῶν ἀναλογιῶν  
καὶ τῆς κρίσεώς γε τῶν ποιημάτων, ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ἡ  
ῥητορικὴ μένος ὅλον ἄττικοῦ πυρὸς ἀναπνέουσα,  
χρυσείοις περιδεραίοις καὶ ἐνωτίοις καὶ τῷ λοιπῷ  
κόσμῳ τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας γοητεύουσα· ἐπὶ πᾶσι  
καὶ πρὸ τῶν πάντων ἡ τιθηνός σοι φιλοσοφία τῷ  
τραχήλῳ γνησίως μητρικῶς περιπλέκεται.<sup>87</sup>

ἦν τινὰ που μερόπων ἀπὸ πασῶν ἀρετῶν  
στέμματ' ἔειδες ἔχοντα καὶ ἀμφὶ κάρηφι  
φορεῦντα,  
ἴδριν μὲν σοφίης πολυχανδέος, εὐλογον,  
εὖνουν,  
γραμματικὴν τ' ἰδὲ μέτρα πολύτροπα θεσμά  
τε ῥήτρης  
καὶ λογικὴν φυσικὴν τε μαθηματικὴν τ' ἐπὶ  
τῇσι  
πᾶσαν ἀκριβώσαντα μεγαφροσύνησι νόοιο<sup>88</sup>

And from the other side Prudence, stooping to your ear, seems to advise you concerning what is necessary. And on the one side Justice with the scales and balance and her dear equilibrium stands beside you; and on the other Temperance with her pallor and chastity girds your waist with a marvelous belt. And here is

Grammar with her discourse, the etymologies, the analogies and the art of judging poems, and there Rhetoric exhaling the full force of Attic fire, [and] charming those who attend with her gold necklaces and earrings and the rest of [her] ornamentation. Above all and before all, your nursemaid Philosophy embraces your neck like a true mother.

If you saw someone among the people who had a crown of every virtue and carried [it] on his head; a man of capacious wisdom, sensible, kind, who knew grammar and versatile meters and the rules of rhetoric, and who has moreover accurately investigated with his enormous intellect all of logic, physics, and mathematics.

.....

In the prose discourse Prodrornos visualizes Isaac, sitting upon a throne surrounded by Prudence, Justice, and Temperance, along with Grammar, Rhetoric, and Philosophy, while in the poem he is crowned with a garland adorned with all these virtues and arts. It would not be surprising if the prose and verse discourses were part of a diptych or even a triptych. They seem to complement each other, resulting in a rhetorical *tour de force* for an individual who was also an acclaimed author.<sup>89</sup>

Prodrornos wrote multiform compositions not only for the due praise of an individual and other ceremonial occasions, but also for intellectual settings, be it the rhetorical *theatra* or the school. His poem entitled “Verses of Complaint against Providence”<sup>90</sup> and a prose treatise under the title “On Those Who Blaspheme against Providence on Account of Poverty”<sup>91</sup> are probably cases in point. Both works deal with the dire poverty that educated individuals endure in contrast to the material comforts that completely uneducated and low-born artisans enjoy; they also ask whether Providence is to be blamed for this injustice. The works stand very close to one another in terms of motifs and phrasing,<sup>92</sup> but the way that they treat this issue ties them together

86 Isaac was quite a productive and versatile author; see F. Pontani, “The First Byzantine Commentary on the Iliad: Isaac Porphyrogenitus and His Scholia in Par. gr. 2682,” *BZ* 99 (2006): 559–604, at 552.

87 Prodrornos, *Oration* 34, ed. Op de Coul, 212, lines 94–102 (= Kurtz, “Unedierte Texte” 114–15, lines 104–13); for this passage see also Magdalino, *Manuel I Komnenos*, 194.

88 Prodrornos, *Historical Poem* 42, ed. Hörandner, 396–97, vv. 7–12; for this passage see also Pontani, “Isaac Porphyrogenitus,” 552, n. 5.

89 See note 86.

90 Prodrornos, *Verses of Complaint against Providence*, ed. Zagklas, 298–302.

91 Prodrornos, *On Those Who Condemn Providence Because of Poverty*, ed. PG 133:1291–1312.

92 Zagklas, *Theodore Prodrornos*, 306–16.

even more. Whereas the poem is a complaint against Providence regarding the inequality between these two groups, the prose work refutes the argument that Providence is to be blamed for it. Their function is comparable to the rhetorical progymnasmata of *kataskeuē* and *anaskeuē*: the poem stands for *kataskeuē* and the prose work for *anaskeuē*.<sup>93</sup> Most likely, they were used as a ProdrOMIC twinned work at the so-called rhetorical *theatra*, or even as exemplary models for teaching his students these two rhetorical progymnasmata from Aphthonios's textbook.

Now that we have established that Prodromos experimented with such multicomponent works for both ceremonial and teaching or intellectual purposes, it is interesting to see whether other authors made use of this technique throughout the twelfth century. Since both Vassis and Agapitos have argued that the composition of triptychs is an innovative technique invented by Prodromos in the first half of the twelfth century,<sup>94</sup> one might think that the simultaneous writing of two works—one in prose and the other in verse—for the same occasion is a unique characteristic of his literary technique. But Prodromos was by no means the only Komnenian representative of this practice; quite a number of such diptychs survive, by both members of his close intellectual entourage and other twelfth-century authors.

Let us begin with an author who belonged to Prodromos's literary circle, and a set of works that was actually written for him. Niketas Eugenianos composed a prose text,<sup>95</sup> a dodecasyllabic poem of 279 verses, and a hexametric poem of ninety-nine verses<sup>96</sup> on the occasion of Prodromos's death sometime in the

late 1150s.<sup>97</sup> Just like Prodromos, who commemorated the deaths of his teacher Stephanos Skylitzes and of sebastokrator Andronikos in a series of works written in different forms,<sup>98</sup> Eugenianos decided to carry on the practice of his teacher. Although we cannot reconstruct the original context and the order in which these three works were performed, it is certain that Niketas was the one who delivered all three of them. In all of them he mourns the death of his dear friend and teacher by stressing his unparalleled erudition and prolific literary production, but he does so by employing varying forms (prose, dodecasyllables, and hexameters) and treating them from different angles. For example, he stresses Prodromos's schedographic project only in the dodecasyllabic poem and the prose monody;<sup>99</sup> he praises him for the composition of numerous poems and epigrams on various occasions in the dodecasyllabic poem;<sup>100</sup> and in the hexametric poem he provides an imagery of several ancient authors, such as Homer, Plato, and Aristotle, praising him for his boundless knowledge and literary merit in the writing of both prose and verse.<sup>101</sup>

Approximately ten years after Eugenianos's works, and more specifically in 1167/68, the lesser-known grammarian Leo *tou Megistou* composed two monodies on the occasion of the death of *megas betairiarches* George Palaiologos: one in prose<sup>102</sup> and one in 194 dodecasyllabic verses. Apart from a small number of

93 P. Roilos, *Amphoteroglossia: A Poetics of the Twelfth-Century Medieval Greek Novel* (Washington, DC, 2005), 297; see also Zagklas, *Theodore Prodromos*, 324–25. Moreover, Roilos has noted that the same function can be claimed for Prodromos's prose work "Refutation of the Adage That Poverty Begets Wisdom." It would be another example of a bipartite form, if Prodromos ever penned a confirmation in verse.

94 Vassis, "Graeca sunt" and Agapitos, "Schedourgia of Theodore Prodromos."

95 Eugenianos, *Prose Monody*, in L. Petit, ed., "Monodie de Nicetas Eugénianos sur Théodore Prodrome," *VizVrem* 9 (1902): 446–63; see Sideras, *Die byzantinischen Grabreden*, 171–72.

96 Eugenianos, *Verse Monodies*, in C. Gallavotti, ed., "Novi Laurentiani codicis analecta," *SBN* 4 (1935): 203–36, esp. 222–29.

97 This date has been suggested by Hörandner, *Theodoros Prodromos* 21–32; on the other hand, Kazhdan argued that Prodromos's death can be dated ca. 1170; see A. P. Kazhdan and S. Franklin, *Studies on Byzantine Literature of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Cambridge, 1984), 87–115. In my view, the date offered by Hörandner is much more plausible.

98 See Agapitos, "Schedourgia of Theodore Prodromos," 18–19.

99 Eugenianos, *Prose Monody*, ed. Petit, 461.15–18; 461.20–462.4; 462.9–10 (cf. the English translation and discussion in Agapitos, "Schedourgia of Theodore Prodromos," 20–21) and Eugenianos, *Verse Monodies*, ed. Gallavotti, 225, vv. 129–34.

100 Gallavotti ed., 225, vv. 135–59.

101 Ibid., 231, vv. 80–92.

102 The prose monody was first edited in A. Sideras, ed., 25 *ἀνέκδοτοι βυζαντινοὶ ἐπιτάφιοι*—25 *unedierte byzantinische Grabreden* (Thessalonike, 1990), 211–21. However, it was edited again with corrections in O. Lampsidis, "Die Monodie von Leon Megistos auf Georgios Palaiologos Megas Hetaireiarches," *JÖB* 49 (1999): 113–42. Although Lampsidis published only a very small number of verses from the poem, he stressed the striking resemblance of these two works.

verses, the poem remains largely unedited.<sup>103</sup> While the prose work is a monody performed by Leo, the poem, which has also been described as monody by Lampsides, is a dialogue between George Palaiologos's wife and the tomb.<sup>104</sup> Following in the footsteps of Prodomos, Eugenianos, and Leo, Euthymios Tornikes, in the year 1204,<sup>105</sup> commemorated the death of his uncle, Euthymios Malakes, bishop of Nea Patras, in a prose and verse monody.<sup>106</sup> Indeed, the two works are preserved together in the codex 508 of the Romanina Academy in Bucharest.<sup>107</sup> The fragmentarily surviving verse monody is preserved on fol. 5–7 and the prose one on fol. 7–19.<sup>108</sup> Although both texts were meant to be read out together by Tornikes, it is difficult to say whether the order in which they survive in the manuscript reflects the way these two works were delivered.

The fourth surviving diptych is associated with the celebration of an imperial marriage. In the early years of the reign of Isaac II Angelos, and more specifically in 1185 or 1186, Niketas Choniates celebrated the marriage of the emperor to Margaret of Hungary, both in a prose oration and in a poem in fifty-seven political verses.<sup>109</sup> Unlike other diptychs, these two works are not transmitted in the same manuscript: the former is preserved in Marcianus graecus 11.22 (ff. 95<sup>v</sup>–96<sup>v</sup>), while the latter is in Barocci 110 (f. 336<sup>f-v</sup>). As a result, many scholars were previously puzzled by the function of the poem, while some of them even argued against its authorship by Niketas by assuming that it

was rather a work of his brother, Michael Choniates,<sup>110</sup> who is much better known for his poetic talent. However, this does not seem to be the only poem by Niketas;<sup>111</sup> what is more, the prose oration as well as the poem were very likely written for the celebration of Isaac's wedding. Both the prose oration and the poem have very similar structure and content: praise of the imperial bridegroom, the welcome and praise of the beautiful and virtuous bride, and joy at the emperor's reign. However, whereas the oration was delivered by a single person (most probably Niketas himself), the poem was recited by representatives of the Demes. Its title,<sup>112</sup> metrical form (political verse), and structure suggest that the poem had a function similar to that of the public poems by Theodore Prodomos.<sup>113</sup> Hence they seem to serve different roles within the same ceremonial occasion.

If we now turn to twinned works related to an intellectual or school environment, apart from Prodomos's verse *kataskeuē* and prose *anaskeuē* there are three other twelfth-century examples of sets of works that could have been used together. First, the little-known George, who was headmaster of the School of the Forty Martyrs (fl. 1140–1150), wrote three works about a fire: two schede and a poem in dodecasyllabic form.<sup>114</sup> Second, on fol. 94<sup>v</sup>–96<sup>r</sup> of the manuscript

103 Lampsidis, "Leon Megistos," 117.

104 Despite its length, it is also likely that the text was meant to be inscribed.

105 ODB 2:1275. On the other hand, the year 1206 is suggested in Sideras, *Die byzantinischen Grabreden*, 235.

106 For the prose monody see J. Darrouzès, "Les discours d'Euthyme Tornikès," *REB* 26 (1968): 49–121, esp. 73–89. The verse monody was partly edited in F. Ciccolella, "Carmi anacreontici bizantini," *BollClass* 3/12 (1991): 49–68, esp. 64–67.

107 C. Litzica, *Biblioteca Academiei Române: Catalogul manuscriselor grecești* (Bucharest, 1909), 273–74.

108 Darrouzès did not note this because he edited the prose monody only from ms. Petropolitanus gr. 250.

109 The works have been edited together in J. A. van Dieten, *Nicetae Choniatae orationes et epistulae* (Berlin, 1972), 35–46; for a brief discussion of the prose discourse and the poem see idem, *Niketas Choniates: Erläuterungen zu den Reden und Briefen nebst einer Biographie* (Berlin and New York, 1971), 87–95; see also A. Simpson, *Niketas Choniates: A Historiographical Study* (Oxford, 2013), 51–52.

110 The authorship by Niketas was disputed in K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des Oströmischen Reiches* (527–1453), 2nd ed. (Munich, 1897), 284 and van Dieten, *Erläuterungen*, 94. Conversely, G. Moravcsik, "Niketas Akominatos lakodalmi Költeménye (Das Hochzeitspoem des Niketas Akominatos)," *Egyeteme Philologiai Közlöny* 47 (1923): 73–86 argued in favor of Niketas's authorship.

111 Carlo Maria Mazzucchi has argued that some poems copied in the margins of a manuscript of Diodorus Siculus's *Bibliotheca Historica* (Vatic. Gr. 130) are in fact autographs by Niketas; see C. M. Mazzucchi, "Leggere i classici durante la catastrofe (Constantinopoli Maggio-Agosto 1203): Le note marginali al Diodoro Siculo Vaticano gr. 130," *Aevum* 68, fasc. 1 (1994): 164–218 and *Aevum* 69, fasc. 1 (1995): 200–256.

112 Choniates, Poem, ed. van Dieten, 44: Στίχοι τοῦ Χωνιάτου ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀναφωνήσῃ τῶν δῆμων, ὁπηνίκα ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰσαάκιος συνεζύγη τῇ θυγατρὶ τοῦ ῥηγὸς Οὐγγρίας Βελά ("Verses by Choniates for the acclamations of the Demes when the emperor Isaac was married to the daughter of Roger Béla of Hungary").

113 Hörandner, "Court Poetry," 82 (n. 14 above).

114 For the poem, see R. Browning, *Il codice Marciano gr. XI.31 e la schedografia bizantina*, in *Miscellanea Marciana di Studi Bessarionici* (Padua, 1976), 21–34 (repr. in idem, *Studies on Byzantine History, Literature and Education* [London, 1977], no. 16); the



Cambr. Corpus Christi College 486 there are two treatises in verse and prose, most likely from the twelfth century, on the structure of the iambic trimeter.<sup>115</sup> While the dodecasyllabic poem is directed to a member of the imperial family (an emperor or future emperor), the prose treatise does not include any sort of address, but its method of instruction is much more detailed, with the use of examples. Given that both of them were written by the same author, it can be assumed that they were used for teaching the imperial family the art of writing correct dodecasyllabic verses. I would suggest that the prose version, which is more comprehensible and thorough in its description, preceded the poem, which serves as an example of writing correct iambic trimeters along with its mnemonic technique. Finally, two other twelfth-century works are closely related. One is a poem in fifty-two political verses, the other a prose work on the life of Oppian.<sup>116</sup> The poem is attributed with certainty to Constantine Manasses, but the prose work is preserved anonymously in all its three text witnesses.<sup>117</sup> However, they both date to the twelfth century and both have a purely didactic purpose, and Colonna has stressed the similarity between the two works.<sup>118</sup> If we assume that Manasses is also the author of the prose life, then it would be an excellent demonstration of the use of both verse and prose for teaching the life of Oppian.

It is clear that the literary production of the twelfth century teems with diptychs and triptychs; no fewer than twelve such compositions by well-known literati (e.g. Theodore Prodromos, Niketas Eugenianos, Niketas Choniates) or otherwise little-known authors (e.g. Leo *tou Megistou* or George,

*Maistor* of the School of the Forty Martyrs) survive for a wide range of occasions. But the composition of so many diptychs and triptychs by Komnenian authors raises more questions. Were these practices a twelfth-century literary invention? Are Prodromos and the other Komnenian authors the only representatives of these practices? Did these practices cease to exist after the twelfth century?

Prodromos may well have been the most prolific author of both diptychs and triptychs, but he does not seem to have invented at least the former. In contrast with triptychs, diptychs have a longer tradition that goes back to the eleventh century. Already in the mid-eleventh century, poetry is occasionally coupled with prose for the praise of an individual. In the concluding verses of an encomiastic poem for Isaakios Komnenos, Michael Psellos says *καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα σοὺς ἀννυμῆσει πόνους | μέτροις τε ποικίλουσα καὶ λόγοις ἅμα* ("Every tongue will praise your endeavors, embellishing them with metres and prose at the same time").<sup>119</sup> On a different occasion, Psellos's student Theophylact of Ochrid made simultaneous or consecutive use of prose and verse for the same event at least twice. In his prose oration "In Defense of Eunuchs," made for his brother Demetrios Hephaistos, Theophylaktos wrote not only a prose *protheoria*, but also a metrical one in thirty-five dodecasyllables.<sup>120</sup> Both *protheoriai* maintain that Theophylaktos wrote the discourse in defense of eunuchs as a gift to his brother. The second instance of twinned works in Theophylaktos's oeuvre consists of a letter and an epistolary poem,<sup>121</sup> both addressed to the doctor Michael Pantechnes. The poem reads:<sup>122</sup>

schede have been edited partly in Polemis, "Γεώργιος μαῖστωρ Ἀγιοτεσσαρακοντίτης," *Ελληνικά* 46 (1996): 301–6; although the schede are addressed to John of Poutze, it cannot be excluded that they were also used in a school context.

115 S. Delle Donne, "Sedici giambi sul giambo (per un imperatore?) e un trattatello sul giambo dal ms. Corpus Christi College 486 di Cambridge," *Medioevo greco* 13 (2013): 37–56.

116 *Life of Oppian*, ed. A. Colonna, "De Oppiani vita antiquissima," *BollCom* 12 (1964): 33–40. Oppian enjoyed enormous popularity in the twelfth century; see A. Rhoby, "Zur Identifizierung von bekannten Autoren im Codex Marcianus graecus 524," *Medioevo Greco* 10 (2010): 167–204, at 170–71.

117 Laurentianus graecus 31, 3 (fol. 1<sup>r</sup>), Ambrosianus graecus C 222 (fol. 258<sup>r</sup>), and Vat. gr. 1345 (fol. 1b<sup>r</sup>); see Colonna, "De Oppiani vita antiquissima," 40.

118 Colonna, "De Oppiani vita antiquissima," 37.

119 Psellos, *Poem* 18, ed. L. G. Westerink, *Michaelis Pselli Poemata* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1992), 254, vv. 57–58; trans. in Bernard, *Byzantine Secular Poetry*, 52–53 (n. 3 above) (slightly modified).

120 Theophylaktos of Ochrid, "In Defense of Eunuchs," in P. Gautier, ed., *Theophylacte d'Achrida, Lettres* (Thessalonike, 1986), 1:288–331; the poem is on pages 288–91. For this work see M. Mullett, "Theophylact of Ochrid: In Defense of Eunuchs," in *Eunuchs in Antiquity and Beyond*, ed. S. Tougher (Cardiff, 2002), 177–98, and more recently C. Messis, *Les eunuques à Byzance, entre réalité et imaginaire* (Paris, 2014), 321–36.

121 Margaret Mullett has very aptly noted that "of all Theophylact's works it is the poems which dovetail best with the letters"; M. Mullett, *Theophylact of Ochrid: Reading the Letters of a Byzantine Archbishop* (Aldershot, 1997), 243.

122 Theophylaktos of Ochrid, *Poem* 2, ed. Gautier, 1:349–51.

Ἔλθοις καλῶς μοι. Τί φοβεῖς με καὶ πάλιν;  
 Τοῖς νηπίοις φόβητρα τὰ φόβητρά σου.  
 Σὺ φρίττε μᾶλλον ὑπέχειν μέλλων δίκας,  
 ὧν ἱατρὸς μὲν ἀλλὰ καὶ βασιλέων,  
 ἐμοὶ δ' ὄνησιν οὐδὲ μικρὰν εἰσφέρων,  
 οὐθ' ὡς ἱατρός (ἰσχιᾶς γάρ με τρύχει),  
 οὐθ' ὡς κρατούντων (οὐ λύεις γὰρ τὰς μάχας).  
 Δέδιθι λοιπὸν μὴ κρεμασθῆς ἐνδίκως,  
 γέρων δίκην δούς, ἦν πέφευγας ὦν νέος.

Come happily to me. Why are you scaring me again? Your fears are childish bugbears. Rather be afraid of undergoing a punishment soon, since even though you are a doctor, and of emperors at that, you do not do me the slightest benefit, neither as a doctor (for my sciatica is wearing me down), nor as an imperial doctor (for you do not put an end to my battles). So be afraid of being justly hanged, receiving in old age the punishment which you avoided in your youth.

As with the poem, letter no. 129 is also addressed to Pantechnes, asking him to visit the sick archbishop and to have no fear about his payment.<sup>123</sup> Moreover, the tone and wording are very similar in both works.<sup>124</sup> Whereas Gautier and Mullett argued that both works were sent together,<sup>125</sup> it has recently been suggested that the verse letter was most probably sent after the prose one.<sup>126</sup> Be that as it may, it is an excellent case of a twinned work in the genre of late eleventh-century epistolography: a letter and a poem that convey exactly the same message in an epistolary context.

Furthermore, the extensive appropriation of Komnenian literary works and trends by many Palaiologan authors promoted the simultaneous use of prose and verse works for various ceremonial purposes until

the late Byzantine period. To give but a single example: John Chortasmenos, an author who was well acquainted with Prodhromos's work and on many occasions imitated his poetry,<sup>127</sup> composed a multiform composition on the occasion of the death of Andreas Asan and his son Manuel.<sup>128</sup> The funerary commemoration opens with dodecasyllabic poetry, continues with some prose texts, and concludes with poetry in political verse. These three different forms delineate the three stages of the ceremony and help us to visualize it better than any other such composition. More specifically, the dodecasyllabic part consists of four poems that were most probably read aloud by the widow herself. The first poem is a *prooimion*; poem two and three are laments for the loss of her spouse and son, respectively; while the last poem is an *ekphrasis* on Manuel Asan's beauty. The prose part is a dialogue between the mother and her son, whom she has seen in her dreams. At some point the dialogue switches from prose to political verses, without any apparent reason. The commemoration concludes with a poem in political verse by Manuel's teacher, John Chortasmenos, who mourns the loss of his student.

Given the preceding analysis, the practice of diptychs seems to have been in use from the eleventh century up to the late Palaiologan period, but it reached its heyday in the twelfth century with the works of Theodore Prodhromos and other Komnenian authors. Indeed Prodhromos expanded its scope by introducing schedography as a third part. Triptychs do not seem to have become as popular in Komnenian and Palaiologan literary circles, for such compositions by any other author do not survive.<sup>129</sup>

Both diptychs and triptychs were written for a number of occasions and across various genres (e.g., encomia, funerary orations, epithalamia, epistolography, *progymnasmata*). To fully reconstruct the context of these ceremonial or intellectual occasions and understand the place of these multicomponent works

123 Ibid., 2:583.

124 Ibid.: Τοῖς νηπίοις φόβητρα τὰ φόβητρά σου and Τὰ δὲ φόβητρα, ἃ ἡμῖν ἐπανατίεσθε, μορμούκια παιδῶν εἰσὶν ἡγουν τινῶν ἐπισκόπων. . . .

125 Gautier, *Théophylacte d'Achrida*, 2:108–9 and Mullett, *Theophylact of Ochrid*, 243.

126 F. Spingou, "Words and Artworks in the Twelfth Century and Beyond: The Thirteenth-Century Manuscript Marcianus gr. 524 and the Twelfth-Century Dedicatory Epigrams on Works of Art" (PhD diss., Oxford, 2013), 168.

127 Hörandner, *Theodoros Prodhromos*, 34–35 and idem, "Muster-autoren," 212 and 216 (n. 68 above).

128 H. Hunger, ed., *Johannes Chortasmenos (ca. 1370–ca. 1436/37) Briefe, Gedichte und kleine Schriften: Einleitung, Regesten, Prosopographie, Text* (Vienna, 1969), 227–37.

129 Perhaps with one exception. Agapitos has argued that Niketas Eugenianos's prose monody and the two poems written on the occasion of Prodhromos's death are probably parts of a triptych; see Agapitos, "Schedourgia of Theodore Prodhromos," 23, n. 102 (n. 41 above).

within an author's corpus, we should read all their parts together as unities. Even if the parts of a diptych or a triptych do not always treat the occasion from the same perspective, or are not directed to the same addressee, all of them are associated with the very same occasion or event. For example, as noted above, Prodhromos's triptych on the death of the sebastokrator Andronikos consists of a prose monody to commemorate his death and a schedos and poem addressed to his mother Irene Doukaina. Thus the former has a public character, the poem and the schedos a private one. As with the "mixed works," all these multiform compositions are conventionally grouped under the umbrella term of diptychs and triptychs, since we cannot be entirely sure about the exact circumstances of their composition and delivery. In contrast with the Latin authors of diptychs, who made programmatic statements surrounding the authorial decision to compose one work in verse and another in prose,<sup>130</sup> the Byzantines unfortunately provide no explanation for the composition of two or even three works for the very same occasion. Most likely, it would depend on the nature of the occasion. For instance, in a ceremony they would enhance the encomiastic effect,<sup>131</sup> while in a school setting they would be used as exemplary models of treating the same subject in different form.



Unlike Theodosios's introductory tetrastich to his prose letter which opened the present paper, the synergy of prose and verse in the twelfth century goes beyond attaching poetry as metrical paratext next to prose. Poetry does not play a secondary role, but it is used together with prose, either for the narrative of a single work, in the case of "mixed works," or as an equivalent part in diptychs and triptychs, respectively. However, much work lies ahead, since the preliminary discussion of these two practices leaves many questions open. How did the Byzantine audience or readership respond to these compositions? Did this alternation of prose and

verse bring more pleasure? How were the diptychs and triptychs delivered?<sup>132</sup> Most importantly, why were the Komnenian authors so keen to produce such multiform compositions?

Several answers can be given to the last question, for instance, and each of these two practices is a result of distinct circumstances, but it is definitely not a coincidence that both of them became literary trends in the twelfth century. Both should be seen as a result of the exponential increase in the production of verse and the fading of the role of prose as the dominant form of Byzantine literary culture. Moreover, if we want to determine a common principal force behind this development, increasing sophistication in both literary experimentation and rhetoric are the central factors. The Komnenian period has frequently been seen as a turning point for Byzantine literary culture, with the resurgence of ancient genres (e.g., satire and the novel), the first appearance of works in vernacular, and various literary experiments with the creation of new genres (e.g., the schedourgia by Theodore Prodhromos).<sup>133</sup> At the same time, rhetorical variety played an important role in Byzantium;<sup>134</sup> it is well known that authors whose oeuvre comprises works in both prose and verse were celebrated for their talent to achieve a rhetorical *poikilia*, or "variety." For instance, a certain Hesaias, allegedly Mauropous's secretary, in a book epigram following Mauropous's works in the famous manuscript Vaticanus graecus 676, speaks about the rhetorical variety that the eleventh-century intellectual achieved by writing in different forms and genres, including orations, letters, and poems; the "threefold variety of *logoi*"

132 For instance, in Prodhromos's triptychs there seems to be no fixed sequence. In the "encomiastic triptych" for Alexios Aristenos we are told that the poem was written after the prose and schedos, while in his "funerary triptych" for the sebastokrator Andronikos the delivery of the prose text and the poem seem to precede that of schedos.

133 Agapitos, "Schedourgia of Theodore Prodhromos"; for insightful ideas about the trends of Komnenian literature see P. Magdalino, *Manuel I Komnenos* (n. 7 above); for more recent studies see I. Nilsson, *Raconter Byzance* (n. 8 above); eadem, "Komnenian Literature," in *Byzantine Culture: Papers from the Conference "Byzantine Days of Istanbul" [Istanbul'un Doğu Roma Günleri] Held on the Occasion of Istanbul Being European Cultural Capital 2010, Istanbul May 21–23 2010*, ed. D. Sakel (Istanbul, 2014), 121–31.

134 For various discussions of rhetoric in Byzantium see Jeffreys, *Rhetoric in Byzantium* (n. 14 above); see also E. C. Bourbouhakis, "Rhetoric and Performance," in *The Byzantine World*, ed. P. Stephenson (London and New York, 2010), 175–87.

130 A telling example is Alcuin's statement that his prose life of St. Willibrord was designed to be read in the church service, while its metrical counterpart "for private study as an edifying model of versification"; see Godman, "Anglo-Latin Opus Geminatum," 224 (n. 67 above).

131 See Agapitos, "Schedourgia of Theodore Prodhromos," 20.

(v. 13: τῇ τριτοειδεῖ τῶν λόγων ποικιλίᾳ), to use Hesaias's exact words.<sup>135</sup> In the twelfth century, rhetorical versatility was expected to a much larger degree by the Byzantines; in a partly published schedos addressed to his fellow teacher and intellectual Prodromos, Ioannikios the monk says:<sup>136</sup>

Καὶ τίς γὰρ οὐκ ἴδῃσι τοῦτον [sc. Πρόδρομον]  
 . . . ὡς ἱκανὸν ὄντα τῆς τέχνης αὐτῆς καὶ τὸν περὶ  
 ταύτην διδάσκαλον; τίς οὐκ οἶδεν ἐμβοᾶν<ν>  
 νέῳ παντὶ καὶ γηραιῷ ῥητόρων τοῦτον τὸν  
 πρόκριτον; τίς οὐκ αἰνεῖ τῶν φιλόσοφων; ὅταν  
 ἱαμβίζει ἢ δαψιλῆς τῶν τούτου λόγων βλῦσις καὶ  
 ἡρωϊζῇ τις ἐμποιεῖ καινὸν θαυμασμόν· ὁμοίως  
 δὲ καὶ λογογραφεῖ καὶ ἐπὶ σχεδοπλοκεῖ.

And who does not consider him . . . as skilled at this art [sc. schedography] and teacher of this art? Who cannot proclaim him for all young and old people the most excellent of rhetors? Which of the philosophers does not praise him? When his abundant flow of words is speaking in iambs and in hexameters, for some he produces a novel admiration. Similarly, he also writes both prose and schedē.

135 Bernard, *Byzantine Secular Poetry*, 51–52.

136 Ioannikios, *Schedos*, ed. Vassis, “Graeca sunt,” 7, n. 27.

Here Ioannikios calls Prodromos the most adroit grammarian, rhetor, and philosopher. His skill in writing poetry (both in iambs and hexameters), prose, and schedē is matchless.

Thus, in a fiercely competitive social environment like that of twelfth-century Constantinople, Prodromos and other authors who attempted to achieve rhetorical variety and become authoritative intellectuals did not limit themselves to composing either prose or verse works across a wide range of literary genres; they experimented further by bestowing verse form on genres traditionally written in prose, such as verse novels and chronicles; by blending verse with prose in a single work, as in the “mixed works”; and finally by inventing novel multicomponent works, such as the twinned works in verse and prose or even triplets of works in prose, verse, and schedography. Although the Byzantines viewed both verse and prose as *logoi*, in twelfth-century Byzantium there is a marked shift in their relationship. Their relationship becomes particularly fluid and complex, resulting in the production of ostentatious rhetorical fireworks in both the public and the private spheres.

University of Vienna  
 Department of Byzantine and  
 Modern Greek Studies  
 Postgasse 7/1/3  
 A-1010 Vienna, Austria  
 nikolaos.zagklas@univie.ac.at

THIS PAPER WAS WRITTEN WITHIN THE framework of the project “Byzantine Poetry in the ‘Long’ Twelfth Century (1081–1204): Texts and Contexts,” funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF P 28959-G25). Working drafts were presented at the Byzantine Studies Conference in New York (October 22–25, 2015) and at Dumbarton Oaks. I would like to thank both audiences for their insightful feedback. I would also like to extend my thanks

to Mary Cunningham, Byron MacDougall, Andreas Rhoby, Alice-Mary Talbot, David Ungvary, and the anonymous readers for offering suggestions and corrections on successive drafts of this paper. Special thanks are due to Ingela Nilsson, Panagiotis Agapitos, Kristoffel Demoen, and Marc Lauxtermann, who carefully read through the penultimate draft and offered constructive criticism for improvements. If not otherwise indicated, all translations are my own.